DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 227 TM 032 512

AUTHOR	Middleton, Sue
TITLE	Researching Pleasures: Care of the Scholarly Self.
PUB DATE	2001-04-00
NOTE	30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001). For a related study, see TM 032 513.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; Doctoral Programs; Foreign Countries; *Graduate Students; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Research; *Researchers; *Self Concept
IDENTIFIERS	Foucault (Michel); New Zealand; Self Fulfillment

ABSTRACT

Michel Foucault wrote of the "well-managed life" as one that would require a certain "care of the self." As a preliminary to the exploration of the care of the self as a scholar, this paper explores why scholars choose to live the "researching life" in the first place. The experiences of 57 people who completed Ph.D.s in Education in New Zealand provide the data for this exploration. Interviews with these scholars show the important influences of family, community, and school, and for some, religious values. Whatever the eventual directions their scholarship took, the participants described their childhood and adolescent years as foundational. Many reported an early interest in problem solving. Of these 57 researchers, 31 had at some point taught in the primary schools. Working as a teacher, more than attending college, was likely to have inspired them to become education academics or professional researchers. Success at the master's degree level led them to continue to doctoral programs. For most of those interviewed, the experience of doing the Ph.D. could be conceptualized in terms used by Foucault: as a tension between being subject of disciplinary norms and crafting an independent scholarly self. (Contains 35 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 227

Researching Pleasures:
Care of the Scholarly Self

Professor Sue Middleton
Department of Education Studies
School of Education
University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton
NEW ZEALAND
Phone: (07) 838 4500
Fax: (07) 838 4555

e-mail: educ_mid@waikato.ac.nz.

http://www.waikato.ac.nz/education/edstudies/middleton/sue'shome.html

Paper presented in the symposium, *'Tinkering With Foucault's Tool-Kit'* at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, April 10 – 14. 2001.

TM032512

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Middleton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Foucault's final works – *The use of pleasure* (1985) and *The care of the self* (1986) had been gathering dust on my shelves. His detailed readings of the classical Greek and imperial Roman equivalent of medical and 'self-help' texts on sexuality seemed somewhat remote from my present research on the epistemology, pedagogy, and everyday experiences of PhD research in Education in New Zealand from 1948-1998.[1] However, in part provoked by a recent review essay that pointed to the neglect by educationists of Foucault's final works (Mayo, 2000)[2], I dusted them off. And, upon closer reading, I saw strong parallels between my current concerns and those of the later Foucault, who "felt obliged to study the games of truth in the relation of self with self and the forming of oneself as subject taking as [his] domain of reference and field of investigation what might be called the 'history of desiring man' " (Foucault, 1985, p. 6).

Consider, for example, the following statement from one of my interviewees (I shall call him Maurice)[3] talking about his 'will to scholarship'- the passion that consumed him - in the process of writing his thesis:

> It was actually quite painful, that obsessive, compulsive disorder where you kind of go to bed sleeping, thinking about it, dreaming about it and then wake up in the morning, trying to solve what I thought was a logical problem that was absolutely at the centre of the thesis and

---

[1] During 1999 I interviewed 56 people (32 men and 24 women) who had completed PhDs in Education in New Zealand. Another interview from a previous project was also (with consent) included, making a total of 57. The focus of the interviews was threefold – epistemological (the nature of their research topics, theories and methods); pedagogical (their experiences of supervision), and biographical dimensions (why they did PhDs, how they organised their time and space, etc) During 2000 the transcripts were edited, returned to the interviewees for comments and, if required, edited a second time. The data were then entered into NUD_IST. This paper is a first foray into the 'biographical' strand of the data base. The epistemological and pedagogical material will be explored in forthcoming publications, including a 'State of the Art' monograph I am writing for the NZARE series, provisionally entitled *Educating researchers: Education doctorates in New Zealand 1948 – 1998.*

[2] I take issue with the oversimplification of Mayo's characterisation of previous 'Uses of Foucault' by educationists, but shall leave a more detailed critique to another occasion. In brief, she accuses educational writers of "twin tendencies to use Foucault to bolster claustrophobic accounts of power or to analyze under-examined narratives of the self" (Mayo, 2000, p. 104). Educationists have, she argues, focussed too heavily on the first two phases of Foucault's work. Mayo's binary is somewhat unfair to narrative researchers who have conceptualised human subjects as multiply and contradictorily positioned – biographically, culturally, historically, geographically etc – and whose actions, thoughts and desires are viewed as creative strategies, both constitutive of, and constituted by these positionings (eg Casey, 1996; Weiler and Middleton, 1999). This simplification results from Mayo's purist commitment to "a full and complete Foucauldian analysis of education" (Mayo, 2000, p.113). Most educationists' uses of Foucault are less purist. Foucault himself urged us not to study him as a grand theorist, but to use his 'tool-kit' (Foucault, 1980b, p. 143) to 'do genealogies' (Macey, 1995, p. 450).

[3] Although the majority of the interviewees have consented to be identified by their real names in publications relating to their research projects, I have chosen to use only pseudonyms when discussing personal information.

> so on. Of course it wasn't, and wasn't particularly important, but I'd get up, at these points and scribble down notes madly.

My interviewees, like the Greek and Roman philosophers and medics in Foucault's texts, speak of " ... the forms of elaboration of ethical work (*travail ethique*) that one performs on oneself, not only in order to bring one's conduct into compliance with a given rule, but to attempt to transform oneself into the ethical subject of one's behaviour" (Foucault, 1985,p. 27). How do we craft our-selves as scholars? How do people become, for example, like the supervisor described so glowingly by Gordon:

> I looked at him and I learnt a lot. I saw somebody who was at work early in the morning, who worked to 6 o'clock, and who went home. He made a point of spending time at the weekends with his family - this could not always happen, but it was important to have a balance. He had a balance in his life. I saw the human side of him, and the academic. I saw him as a mentor, and I thought he was a wonderful model to follow ... I thought he had got things in balance. He was a successful academic, he was not tilting too far one way and, as a workaholic, I needed that kind of warning.

The dangers of excess – of being engulfed by desire - were a source of anxiety in antiquity and Foucault's genealogy meticulously explores texts that guided citizens towards moderation and self-regulation in matters of routine, diet, regimen and 'care of the self.' An unbalanced, or immoderate approach could lead to disaster. For example, Charles said: "I had a wife who complained that she never saw me and at the end of the process left because she said it wouldn't make any difference to me." The well-managed life studied by Foucault in classical texts required

> the development of an art of existence that revolves around the question of the self, of its dependence and independence, and of its universal form and of the connection it can and should establish with others, of the procedures by which it exerts its control over itself, and of the way in which it can establish a complete supremacy over itself (Foucault, 1986, p.288).

The 'care of the self' required a certain austerity – it might entail "a sudden, all-embracing renunciation of pleasures" (Foucault, 1985, p. 27) - as Christopher outlines:

> There were trade offs for me - I had to demarcate in my life and interests and work. I decided that research was my hobby and it wasn't my work. I had to demarcate between my work and my hobby. It's been interesting since I've put the PhD down because my real hobbies have come out. They were obviously repressed at the time. You can't do all that you want to do so you've actually got to prune out things from your life.

Another paper at this conference will address the personal strategies deployed by successful PhD students in education in crafting the self as scholar during the thesis writing process - managing households and family life, demarcating time and space, prioritising activities, and the internal

struggles of self against self (Middleton, 2001). But first – in this paper – I want to explore the processes by which we come to choose to live the 'researching life' in the first place. How does the passion to do research – the 'will to scholarship' - begin?

As Deborah Britzman (1998, p. 5) has put it, "What attaches the psychical to the social and the social to the psychical are matters of love and hate in learning ... How does education live in people and how do people live in education?" How do practising academics account for the idiosyncratic biographical origins of their desire - the processes by which "we come to attach ourselves to as well as to ignore particular ideas, theories and people" in educational theory and research (Britzman, 1998, p. 16)? Catherine Bateson describes recent autobiographical accounts by educational researchers as:

> ... stories of the evolution of curiosity and attention, for research is one of the activities through which we continue the processes of learning and exploration so crucial in childhood, transformed to offer new knowledge to the society rather than knowledge new only to the individual. It is crucial to the field of education to understand how curiosity can continue to develop in adulthood (Bateson, 1997, p. i)

New Zealand PhD graduates' own stories of the evolution of curiosity and attention from childhood, into adulthood and up until their enrolment as PhD candidates form the basis for the following account.

Researching Lives

Albeit in a very different context, this paper is concerned with what Foucault termed a history of the experience of desire, "where experience is understood as the correlation between fields of knowledge; types of normativity, and forms of subjectivity of a particular culture" (Foucault, 1985, p. 3). The 'fields of knowledge' that together comprise 'Education Studies' offer subject positions that students and experienced researchers take up, resist, challenge and change. Our work takes form in relation to 'types of normativity,' which include degree regulations, university handbooks, departmental practices, and the conventions of professional organisations (such as NZARE), conferences, journals, e-mail discussions, reading groups, codes of ethics etc. The 'forms of subjectivity' – constraints and possibilities for how we can, and do, come to think, speak, write, and feel as scholars – cannot be understood simply as productions of isolated minds.

Interviews, too, are discursive productions. What interviewees tell interviewers depends, among other things, on their interpretations of the questions asked; their readings of the scholarly fields and institutional or professional normativities that shape the project; their sense of trust (or otherwise) in the interviewer; their willingness or ability to delve into what can at times be

emotionally fraught (or blocked) memories; how they are feeling at the time of the interview – stressed, pressed for time, preoccupied, relaxed, etc. And, of course, the narratives I produce for publication emerge from the orientations of the texts available to me, the texts that 'attract' me, the texts I reject (Britzman, 1998). They are shaped within the constraints and possibilities of the fields of study that inform my theoretical and methodological orientation (Foucault, 1980a), and the technological form of the electronic NUD*IST software program that I have used to code the transcripts into a data-base (Haraway, 1995; Poster, 1995)[4]. They are also produced within the ethical and other 'normativities' to which my professional and institutional locations commit me – including the fact that I am researching and writing about the very networks of collegial relationships that sustain my own work. And they surface from the emotional underworld and sense of relevances suggested by my own psyche (Britzman, 1998; Butler, 1993; Ellsworth, 1998). As academic production, as educational research, this paper "is an engagement with the realm of discourse and inevitably bound by its rules and limitations" (Harvey, 1996, p. 113).

Growing up: Family, community and school

Writing of her own life as an educational researcher, Lorrie Neilson commented that "If we are socially constructed, our individual scholarly history must be, in its unique way, part of a history of the profession itself" (Neilson, 1998, p. 7). Drawing on Merleau-Ponty's phemomenology of perception, Maxine Greene observes that:

> On the original landscape where an individual is grounded, where her or his life began, there is always a sense of consciousness being opened to the common. When we are in the midst of things, we experience objects and other people's actions corporeally and concretely. And, despite the distancing and symbolising that come later, the narratives we shape out of the materials of our lived lives must somehow take into account our original landscapes if we are to be truly present to ourselves and to partake in an authentic relationship with the young (Greene, 1975, p. 75).

The interviewees 'spoke their childhoods' to me through the concepts of their adult academic knowledge. Particularly striking were accounts of social class. As Hacking (1991, p. 194) has expressed it, "The bureaucracy of statistics imposes not just by creating administrative rulings but by determining classifications within which people must think of themselves and of the actions open to them." A large proportion of those interviewed described their parents and/or grandparents

[4] See note 1 above.

as 'working-class.'[5] Simon, a post-war baby-boom child, described a youthful passion for economics at school and related this enthusiasm to his family's class location:

> I loved economics. I thought here was a vehicle with which one might change the world a bit. I saw that Economics was a tool for shaping policy. My family was a working class family and a Labour Party family. I remain a member of the Labour Party to this day, not without some misgivings along the way. So I had an initial sort of socialist economic perspective on life. And I enjoyed it at school. I had an excellent teacher, though I didn't admit to that for a long time because I came to see the school I went to as a bastion of middle class values. I had a difficult time there in some respects but it changed the way I saw things.

Simon was one of five interviewees who spoke of the importance of their Catholic upbringing in the formation of what Maxine Greene (1995, p. 1) has called "a quest for a better state of things for those we teach and for the world we all share." Another example is Perry, whose parents had attained a more middle-class level of income and status. He too had taken his family's core values through into his teaching and later research and spoke about:

> the social justice thing - I was brought up a Catholic and that is a very powerful thing. I have thrown away a lot of it now but that side of it I think has definitely coloured so much of my work... I have always had a kind of concern. And also being schooled in Catholic schools I think you do get a sense of being taught that everyone should be on the same level. There is an egalitarianism – that's the rhetoric anyway!

Similarly, Gordon explained how:

> Both my parents were in business and were successful in a very poor area of the city - very working class. I came from a fairly privileged background. I got to see the sacrifices that they had made for other people and how they did a lot for their community and were respected for that. They were very political people, Labour Party, very political... Very passionate, very caring. They'd do anything for you, and then, at the end of the day, they might begin to think about themselves. They would always put other people first. It is really a Christian way of living, without their being devout Christian.

---

[5] Both parents' highest levels of education and occupations were listed by each interviewee, along with other basic biographical information, on a form prior to interview. The term 'working-class' was used by some interviewees to describe themselves, their parents or grandparents. Of the 56 interviewed, 16 described their father's occupation as a trade. These included a train driver, a roofing contractor, a boilermaker and a builder. Four fathers owned and operated small businesses such as shops. There were 12 with fathers in professional or managerial positions. These included one school principal, one doctor, two bank managers, and a number of accountants. Many of the accountants, however, did not have any or much secondary education and may have been 'book-keepers'. There were 6 public servants, one of whom was a post-master, and most of whom were clerks. 2 were described as 'railway workers', Only three had fathers who were teachers or in social services, but 3 were brought up by solo mothers; 2 described fathers as unemployed; and 2 described them as unskilled labourers. 6 fathers were farmers. Mothers had – particularly in the case of older interviewees – been 'housewives' at the time the interviewees were growing up. However, 8 had at some stage qualified as and/or worked as teachers, 4 had been nurses; 7 were in retail or sales; 6 had done office work. Some shared the work on family farms.

One of the younger interviewees, whose parents had degrees and professional occupations, traced his enthusiasm for liberation politics to his family:

> My parents were interested in social issues. They were quite active in church politics ...They were involved with those people pushing social issues in the church when there was a lot of radical stuff going on in the Catholic Church before the Vatican swung around the other way. So I suppose that would have been an influence. And my parents had been involved in early anti-tour stuff and anti-apartheid stuff, were Corso supporters and stuff like that for a long time and so there was a bit of a feeling. ..

Although he had won a scholarship to a Catholic secondary school, his parents had "given it back to the school."

Themes of what one interviewee called "service to the community" came through in many of the interviews and, for some, strongly influenced their later decisions to go teaching. Four of the interviewees had dreamed as youngsters of a religious life. For example, Ralph, one of the older interviewees, explained that:

> I always had a philosophical bent of mind right from the beginning and was very interested in religion and theology and Christian religion. I formed the opinion during my secondary years that I would like to be a missionary. My father, who was a man with his feet on the ground said, "That's all very well, you may well do that, but you should get a solid qualification first in something in case it doesn't work out - in something which would be useful." He suggested I ought to get a qualification in teaching.

Barry, whose father was a Minister in a protestant church, stated that "Right from a very early age, certainly about aged eight, I was very committed to following a theological path". Similarly, Lionel, a Catholic, explained that he

> felt that I had a vocation. I felt I did. My sister was in an order ... I thought well you know she's done it I might as well do it too. I did want to go but I didn't want to go unqualified 'cause I had this nagging thing in the back of my mind that what happens if you don't succeed? And I knew I'd always be a teacher.

One of the Catholic women, Mary, "seemed to be destined to be a teacher from the time I was about 12, when I actually wanted to be a nun ... I wanted to go to the novitiate that young untrained novice nuns went to. I wanted to do that rather than go to the local secondary school, but my parents didn't want me to."

Two of the younger men explained that they were influenced to go teaching by their church work in the sense that

> Growing up in a religious environment you tend to get into youth groups and stuff like that. I went to Boys Brigade and all those sorts of things so you got a sense of working with other

> people and I went to leadership courses and things like that so I guess my religious background almost pushed me...

In contrast, Rachel grew up in a strict protestant home in which religious austerity was combined with a strong working-class 'anti-intellectualism.' Her strategy was intellectual rebellion:

> My parents never read books, we didn't. Reading was a real treat and weren't really supposed to read at home. My parents were fairly religious. You were supposed to be doing something around the place to help and reading is sitting on your bum doing nothing. So I used to lock myself in a wee upstairs room and read. I loved reading and I think perhaps that's why I loved English. So I did English and it was such a breeze.

Parental valuing of education in working-class families varied and sometimes resonated down the generations. Anthony described a grandfather who had not attended a secondary school and:

> very clear memories of a sense of academic frustration... So in some ways there was always the sense of growing up in an environment where education was quite highly valued. There were always discussions at meal times on politics and my grandfather was an early member of the Labour Party so there was that sort of background. He knew some of the early suffragettes. He was born in 1888 and he grew up as a young child in that environment and I think I was always challenged by him intellectually. He often said that he was living his life through his grand children.

Jody, a passionate reader, spoke of her distress when her financially stretched family moved away from a city library and, because they had moved to an outlying borough, would have had to pay to use the city library. Suddenly there was "limited access to books and I remember just constantly re-reading the same books over and over and over and over again."

In some families, cultural politics – including racism – in their communities wove into the psyches of their growing children, as one of the Maori interviewees described:[6]

> We were an extremely politicised family. Our mother was very political ... The local politics and the racism, I guess, was very in those days against solo parents, which wasn't a great situation for our family to be in. So there were all of those kinds of things which I think were very influential in how we thought. You only have to look at my brothers and sisters and what they're doing and how they interact politically with the world - you can see that there is a fairly common thread there. So we were politicised.

Race-relations issues in childhood were also described by some Pakeha[7] as important foundations for their adult intellectual and political concerns. Kate's family relocated when she was a child:

---

[6] Two identified as Maori; 1 claimed Maori and Pakeha descent. 9 had immigrated to NZ at some time during their school years – 1 was an indigenous Pacific Islander; 3 were from Commonwealth countries and of European descent; and 5 had come from the UK.

> it was only a township of about two hundred people but it had a really high proportion of Maori people living there. So that was my first experience of living in the community and having a lot to do with friends with close Maori connections. Socialising and special events of the community were shaped by having a hangi for celebrations and things like that. I loved that and I think that was really formative in terms of shaping my sense of what it meant to live here in New Zealand.

All four of the Maori and Pacific Islands doctoral graduates interviewed described their academic success as generated by and on behalf of their communities rather than as an individual achievement, as in the following example:

> During my class 5, which is equivalent of standard 3, there was a competition in our island. I somehow won the competition. It was a mathematics competition and in terms of my own performance in mathematics I was encouraged by the response of the family and the response of my school in the island right at a very young age - maybe I knew something in mathematics ... At the end of the sixth form I knew that I could pass New Zealand University Entrance exam and I decided that I would want to pursue study at university level to gain a qualification for myself and my family - to be the very first one in the family to gain a degree.

Similarly, a Maori Boarding School graduate described how

> I was strongly motivated. We were filled up with the ideology that rested on the Maori boarding schools - you had a role to play and you were a role model. So extremely conscientious and I think reflective of that kind of support from the school. But I think beyond that, in terms of where we've come from as a family and the context in which we lived ... the history of that is that it's one of the first areas in which Maori lost land. It's one of the first places where the loss of language was felt. It was one of the most red-necked places in the 1960s in New Zealand. Going through that experience in schools was very formative... Basically the racism and so on had a very formative impact on wanting to do well, to show people that we were capable, we could achieve.

James, who identified as both Maori and Pakeha, had been brought up in a largely Pakeha community and said that:

> I can still remember the Maori kids at our school. Hone Brown[8], I can still remember the way he was pursued. If I close my eyes I can get back into the classroom with the teacher. I can still name the teacher and I can still name the incident of Hone Brown being hounded out of the school, basically hounded out of the school. It was the fourth form - most Maori kids never got past the fourth form; they were just hounded out of the place.

---

[7] New Zealand-born citizens of European descent

[8] Pseudonym

A feeling that 'something was wrong' or a sense of injustice at school was sometimes described in personal terms as 'not fitting in', as in the case of Judith's account of "being a scholarship child at a private school... : "People were very nice to you but they'd say things like well we are going out on the boat but we didn't invite you 'cause we knew you couldn't afford it." [9] As David Harvey (1996, p. 103) has expressed it, "The margin is nor simply a metaphor, but an imaginary that has real underpinnings. From that location a powerful condemnation of supposedly emancipatory discourses shaped at the centre can be launched." Or, in Edward Said's words:

> The pattern that sets the course for the intellectual as outsider is best exemplified by the condition of exile, the state of never being fully adjusted, always feeling outside the chatty, familiar world inhabited by natives, so to speak, tending to avoid and even dislike the trappings of accommodation and national wellbeing (Said, 1993, p. 39)

While Judith described her marginalisation as having gravitated her towards leftist politics and theories, another interviewee's similar situation had a different effect on him psychologically:

> I went to a little private boarding school. If you don't get caught up in the status symbolisation system then you don't get caught up in anything, so status has always been a factor. And I think that is the university's business, to peddle status and, if you want to be a peddler, you'd better have some!

Whatever the eventual directions they came to take – in terms of disciplinary foundations, theoretical orientations, political ideals, research topics, questions and methodologies – interviewees described their childhood and adolescent years as foundational of these. While a few had left school without the formal qualifications needed, or the desire to enter tertiary study as school leavers, many by this stage had developed a passion for learning, or reading, or political, religious or social commitment.

The delights of 'problem solving' were discovered early by some. Felicity described the extraordinary efforts of her grandfather, an amateur scientist whose findings were later used by a government agency:

> My grandfather was a very much a self made man, a tough kiwi bloke - but more than that. He was a great fisherman and I used to go out with him as a child. Every fish he caught, he kept scales and labelled them and dated them. He built up an amazing knowledge. So I had been part of that labelling, watching, understanding and explaining process around the fish. What I learned from him - not from school - is that you can make your own knowledge

[9] 22 had attended single-sex public schools; 17 had been to co-educational high schools (7 of which were rural); 8 had been to secondary school overseas; 7 had attended Catholic high schools; and 4 had attended New Zealand private (other than Catholic) secondary schools (one of these was a Maori boarding school). Some had attended more than one school.

> about something that people are very ignorant about. And that was probably quite deep in my mind.

Kate "was keen to be a detective. I read a lot of detective stories. In fact I think that's why I've become a researcher - because it's as good as being a detective." And Janet, a future mathematics educator, described the pleasures of solving mathematical problems at high school and applying her skills in other school subjects: "I was always interested in maths I think and I always liked doing it as part of geography. I was always fiddling around with the figures - I would measure beaches and draw graphs. I always liked that."

From school to work.

At some stage in their adult lives 31 of the 57 had taught in primary schools, 14 in secondary schools; and 12 had never trained for, or worked in, school teaching. Upon leaving school, 12 had gone directly into the work force, 23 went straight to university and 21 of the interviewees went straight into a primary teacher education course. For many who entered teaching in the years when student teachers were paid, this was one, and in some cases *the*, major incentive. For example, Albert chose college "because they paid you and it wasn't in my life space to contemplate going to university full time. My parents were not well off and it was a matter of survival. In those days teachers, college students were paid, and quite nicely thank you!" Similarly, Donald (one of the older interviewees) surmised:

> Why did I go teaching? I didn't really feel any great call for teaching, but some friends had gone to Wellington Teachers College and said it was really good. And in those days you got paid to go to Teachers College. That was an incentive and I couldn't afford to go to University. My parents weren't wealthy. I couldn't afford to go to University but I understood that you could get pretty generous leave to go to University from Teachers College while you were there, and all of that proved to be so.

Some of those who had gone straight from school to university, had bonded themselves to teaching and been paid under the government studentship scheme while going full-time university degree programmes. Others had signed up for studentships as graduates in order to do a one-year Diploma in Teaching secondary or primary course at teachers college. Maurice, who described himself as 'working-class', explained that "in fact the studentship was seen for me at the time as a way of going to university" rather than as symptomatic of a desire to teach. Another studentship-holder, Tina, reviewed multiple issues that had informed her decision:

> In my seventh form year I found out that you could get a studentship to go to university and it could last for five years - two degrees, or five years, whichever was the lesser. I thought that was a really useful way of going to university ... That was in '79. So I applied for a studentship. I had no intention of going teaching because it was a $1500 bond and I thought,

> well, after five years I'd pay back the fifteen hundred dollar bond and I'd have some money when I was at university...

Most of the women, -particularly those who left school prior to the mid-1980s – described teaching as the best of a limited range of career alternatives for girls (Middleton, 1993). Amy's description was typical: "I had a provincial New Zealand upbringing in small towns. I'm in the immediate post war age group and there were still those options of being a teacher, a dental nurse, a secretary, a nurse - about it really. So which of this fairly small range of possibilities would I go into?" There were, however, a few who were enthused by teaching itself. Christine told how " I had always known I was going to teach since the age of five when I lined up my teddy bears and dolls and told them what to do. I come from a teaching background as well." Felicity had a passion for going primary school teaching, and a related commitment to questions of equality, from an early age:

> I always knew I wanted to be a teacher. I went to university to be a teacher. I hadn't gone on a studentship through some ill-judged feeling that other people might need that money more than I did. I can't believe I did it that way! I was always going to be a teacher and then I worried that I might not be selected. So at the end of my first year I applied for college so that I would be in on a programme when I got out of university.

The status of primary teaching as an occupation, though, was not always so elevated in the perceptions of the interviewees, their peers or those who influenced the career choices. Going to teachers' college was regarded by many as a lower status choice that did not demand too much in the way of intelligence. For some, such as Emma, whose working-class family did not have tertiary education as an expectation, this supposed 'easiness' was a source of encouragement. Furthermore, teaching built on her youthful experience of working, in a voluntary capacity, with children:

> I was a girl and we weren't an educated family, we do not have education within our family, within the immediate family. It was the norm to get pregnant, have babies, to do shop work or whatever. I was one of the first to go to Teachers College and University - wow that surprised me! So it was a very different concept to go to college... My own childhood was based around being with other children, my mother ran a childcare centre, she praised me a lot in terms of how I worked with children as I was growing up. By the age of six I was helping to look after younger children so it's in the blood - it was in the family blood to look after other children. How I came to be in teaching, I guess was a case of having no other choice in the sense that that was what I knew and it was a huge enough goal to become a teacher. I didn't actually believe that I could be accepted for Teachers College. No other career options like economics or accountancy, which I enjoyed at school, appeared to be open to me because my teachers and others did not consider this direction was open to me due to being a girl and having a low maths ability.

Rachel, who also used the term 'working-class' to describe her background, described how her decision to go to college "just happened really. I didn't feel like I could ever go to university because I didn't have the brains. It wasn't an option and everyone went either teaching or nursing. I feel sick with sick people and I think I applied for teaching when everyone was being accepted." Some working-class boys felt similarly, as Christopher explained:

> I had to work very hard and succeeded to be very average. I even heard my mum and dad say one day "Oh he'll never be quite as good as his brother" and it must have cut something to the core. Anyway going through secondary school I realised I wasn't bright enough to go to University. So I applied for Teachers College.

The lower status of primary teaching and teachers colleges as compared with secondary teaching and universities meant that some of the more academically successful school leavers were discouraged from taking it up, as Gina (a teachers' daughter) explained:

> At secondary school I performed well. I remember the principal and the senior mistress of the school desperately trying to talk me out of [primary] teaching. Not the sort of thing they thought I should be doing, I "should be aspiring a little higher" were the kinds of words they were saying. Which, of course, made me all the more determined to do what I'd already decided to do. I was quite a determined teenager. I wasn't going to be told what to do by them and so, yes, I came to college.

The majority of teachers college students had managed to do at least some university courses concurrently. For some, the college itself was exciting and was seen as an important foundation for later intellectual and research interests. For example, Donald described his college as:

> ... an amazing place. I went to Wellington Teachers College in 1954-56 and it was simply an amazing place... It was really a wake-up kind of education. It was probably the greatest experience I ever had in my life ... This is when many of the young poets, novelists and writers were all centring themselves around Wellington.

Christopher, who had struggled through secondary school, had found his first university paper difficult:

> I did [do university] but certainly it took me a lot of trouble. I think I scraped through [English 1] with a 'C' but the college courses were very good. I became interested in those sort of things only at college. People have said about college that it was just playing around ... but I developed a love of literature in college, not at school

Others were less inspired by college, but fell in love with some of the ideas encountered at university. For example, Ralph – who was later to take up developmental psychology - described browsing in the library in the postwar years:

> I used to browse among the psychology books, found them very exciting - especially people like Freud who opened up vistas of interesting things. I got more interested in Social Sciences, so my second year at Teachers College, because we were allowed to take two units, I took Education and Psychology or Philosophy.

And Jack – who was eventually to take up historical and sociological research – had loved his Education courses in the 1950s:

> I did Education One and I loved it and I passed it, which was a tremendous thing for me because it showed me - I passed it well. It was the New Zealand Comparative Course with Professor Bailey. I loved his lectures, they were extremely clear, he was a very good lecturer. He was fascinated by comparative studies, he was interested in teaching.

But it was working as a teacher, as much – and in many cases more – than their undergraduate studies that had inspired many towards becoming education academics and/ or professional researchers. Experiences of marginality as school pupils, combined with seeing similar injustices played out before their eyes in the schools in which they taught, were described by some as formative of their eventual research questions in their PhDs. Several were involved in community groups and social activism that allied with social issues in their schools. For example, Sam was gay and a high school teacher during the late 1980s and early 1990s: "I'd always known it and things were not easy. And here we had the law reform, here we had human rights legislation it was just prior to that going up, why is it that we were not being inundated by these gay and lesbian students who we were teaching?" Similarly, Anna – middle-class and Pakeha - described teaching in the school at a social welfare home for girls:

> That's when I suddenly saw things I'd never seen before, particularly in terms of racism. Most of the girls in there were Maori, most of them were very bright and very attractive and lovely girls. I just adored them to bits, but they had had terrible lives. A lot of them were abused, a lot of them just had very, very difficult lives. I saw in a flash that this is the situation, that it's not that these kids are stupid, dumb, etc., but they had had appalling lives. Also I heard a lot about police harassment from the girls. They told me what had happened to them and I was appalled. So I learnt a hell of a lot about New Zealand in terms of race - things that had been hidden from me really. I think I'd had a fairly complacent attitude and did at some level of my being believe that if you didn't do well at school or got into trouble it was somehow your own fault. The usual 'common sense' kind of ideologies.

Anna was subsequently attracted to neo-Marxist sociological analyses of gender and class. Joy was attracted to liberal feminism when experience as a female senior teacher in the 1980s raised questions of equal opportunities for women in senior positions in teaching:

> I came across a couple of men who made some remarks to me that I had found particularly offensive about the fact that, because I was going on a middle management course, that I was being blatantly ambitious. And then another principal spoke about the fact that if you wanted to be in a senior position then you had to put your job first and your family second. I thought that was just blatantly discriminating against women.

Staffroom politics had also influenced Harold. Primary trained, he had left school without University Entrance in the postwar baby-boom years when entry qualifications to the colleges had been lowered to meet the teacher shortage (Middleton & May, 1997). The status hierarchies in a rural District High School had – rather than 'putting him down' - motivated him to complete a degree:

> I got a relieving job at a combined High School and Intermediate. I was teaching in the Intermediate section... Every morning they'd have assembly. The secondary teachers would all wear their gowns in assembly - the intermediate teachers didn't have gowns because they weren't graduates. I also found that at lunchtime and things like that the secondary teachers all sat at one end of the staffroom and the intermediate primary teachers all sat at the other end. And I thought, "Well, bugger you, I can get one of those gowns if I want to!" So I guess, in that respect I really did my bachelors to kind of prove to myself that I could as well. And I finished up doing my doctorate!

Several spoke about missing academic studies once they became full-time teachers. Dee was one of the younger interviewees, and one of few to graduate with the BEd degree. She had started teaching in the early 1980s, loved her job, and

> I had heaps to learn about teaching but I wasn't getting the academic stimulation. I was the only one reading the research articles in the staffroom - me and the principal. We were reading SET and we were having conversations but my colleagues weren't. They were talking about the beach trip coming up and the lunch boxes which is fine (you have got to talk about those things and I don't mean that to sound like a judgement).

'Education' as a field of academic study.

The relative status of different academic subjects has become a popular topic in the sociology of knowledge since the early 1970s (eg Bernstein, 1971; Bourdieu, 1971). Such analyses point to the "special symbolic economies within disciplines, departments and universities at large that produce and consume research as sign-values to sustain internal command economies of disciplinary

repute, professional prestige, and administrative allocation" (Luke, 1997, p. 54). Chandra Mohanty asks:

> What is at stake in the way intellectual, institutional, pedagogical, and relational territories are drawn, legitimated, regulated and consolidated in educational institutions and systems? What dangers inhere in these cartographies? To whom? What knowledges and identities are legitimated/ delegitimized as a result over the struggles over territorial boundaries and borders? (Mohanty, 1997, p. x)

One of the older interviewees, who had attained senior administrative positions in his university commented with respect to the 'territory' of ' Education Studies' that it "was thought it was an easy subject. One of my aims when I became Head of Department was to change that. I think I can fairly say I did that successfully and put a much more research spin on the whole approach to Education." Another senior academic commented with respect to his undergraduate days in the 1960s that " I was aware even then - I am much more sharply aware now - that education has never been valued as a discipline. It is perceived as a soft option that doesn't contribute epistemologically or psychologically in any substantive way." However, few, if any, of the interviewees described their own encounters with Education Studies in this way.

In fact, a number had abandoned other disciplines to take up Education as a major, a double major, or at masters level. One history student explained how:

> I went back to the Education Department and saw people who were really committed to what they were doing. They were very student centred, but they were also people whom I respected academically because they were vigorous scholars, but they were also skilled caring teachers. They were what I would have wanted in every scholar, but which wasn't always visible.

Maurice, a working-class philosophy student, described why he also abandoned the department in which he had majored in favour of the Education department for his Masters degree:

> I guess the politics of knowledge became really important to me at that point. In particular, I came to see the philosophy department as this privileged little enclave, a kind of pale imitation of the progression of the public school system in Britain where people talked in funny voices about questions which bore no relationship to their own context. That propelled me towards education, which was perceived in the university as being at the bottom of the hierarchy of subjects, and philosophy was at the top.

Maurice and some others others were attracted by theories of the politics and sociology of knowledge. Theories such as Marxism, and the various 'critical theories' that underpinned these fields appealed particularly to those who had been student activists. For example, Lisa had been involved with Nga Tamatoa in the 1970s and found that " the Sociology of Education taught me a

way to analyse what was happening to me as a teacher, but also what was happening to Maori structurally in the system." Like other Maori interviewed, her research would seek "theoretical spaces, pedagogical spaces, structural spaces" (Smith, 1997, p. 203) for Maori in education. A Pakeha social activist said that his anti-racist work around the Springbok rugby tour protests, later connected with his studies in education:

> It was 1981 that actually brought home to me with a lot of clarity that political education was something that happened. There was a lot of political education went on in 1981 that had nothing to do with the university. It was no formal learning context, but people were learning heaps and heaps.

However, the critical sociologies affected others very differently. For example, Janet described struggling through a difficult 'working-class' childhood, enduring domestic violence in her adult life, and her determination to succeed academically against great odds. In Education lectures:

> I heard why working class people fail. Then I thought, "You bastards! You're sitting there saying how people fail and you're not empowering anybody". I looked at some post-modern stuff and I thought, "Fuck this! It doesn't actually tell me how to change any policies!" All I'm interested in is looking at how you change policies and what policies are going to work for people who need empowering. Theories that say that this rationality's as good as that rationality did fuck all for me. It just made me so angry after what I've been through. I thought, "All you intellectuals sitting there - you don't know a shit!" I got really carried away.

To her, liberal individualist positions felt more empowering. Angry with 'Education' she sought supervision for her thesis in another humanities department. One or two others also felt alienated from sociology. A young honours student felt intimidated by older post-graduate students: "They were so intelligent and critical and Marxist – neo-Marxist and radical and wonderful and I kind of revered them. I just felt inadequate. I thought I might just go over to psychology." An older junior lecturer felt uncomfortable in his university department because of his 'blue' political affiliations. A National Party member, he noted that:

> Both at college and university. I stood out because I stood for what I believed in... Both environments were red, tinged with red. They were obviously supportive in those days of the [Labour] opposition ... But for instance one [leftist] person I have great respect for and she me because we got on and are able to be honest with each other and have a decent discussion. She's an intelligent, intellectual, wonderful person ... but with lesser people who just snipe, it made the environment a bit unpleasant.

As an interdisciplinary field, Education offers multiple and competing discursive spaces "in which groups of people align themselves with certain practices and ideas that have value (symbolic capital) in that field" (Johannessen, 1998, p. 303). An historian shifted across into an Education Department for his masters because: "People wrote about it in an interesting way and the fact that you were allowed to state quite controversial opinions in terms of your own schooling was exciting. It was OK to reflect on your own schooling and say well look I went through this kind of school, this is what it was like for me." A developmental psychologist also enjoyed the links between educational research, his own family life, and his personal values:

> That blend of human development with a strong family and early childhood focus is what I spent most of my early years doing. So to me there is a continuity between what I started in terms of seeing service to other people as being the goal and finding an opportunity for doing that with the education background.

Another developmental psychologist alluded to his childhood in connection with his first forays into graduate research:

> What I was interested in was what motivates people to do things, because I was very interested in the whole theory of volition ... I suppose you could say this reflects my background a little - that being a person very interested in religion, the social conscience and all the rest of it, the nature of will and will power seemed an obvious thing.

Similarly, a student's encounters with intellectual debates in university coursework elicited deep-seated psychological conflicts: " My mother thought philosophy was evil because it challenges faith. I remember going through this thing thinking, ' God - well if there is a God surely he'd want us to use our reason if we had any? It wouldn't all be faith!' So I had to work through all those sorts of things."

As discourses, the sub-disciplines that together make up the academic subject Education Studies "express human thought, fantasy and desire. They are also institutionally based, materially constrained, experimentally grounded manifestations of social and power relations" (Harvey, 1996, p. 80). The stories told here by interviewees about their 'thoughts, fantasies and desires' as undergraduate and graduate students in Education, can help us to "understand and make problematic the classificatory criteria through which individuals are to be disciplined and self-regulated" as doctoral students, as academics and/or as professional educational researchers (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998, p. 13). How and why did those interviewed come to take on doctoral projects? How do they describe their 'will to scholarship' – their obsessions, their compulsion to pursue a major piece of research and writing, even at great personal cost?

Becoming a doctoral student

Doctoral degrees were described by many as 'an apprenticeship', or a 'rite of passage.' To be 'hailed' or 'interpellated' (Althusser, 1971) as 'Dr' is to enter the highest symbolic order of academe. As one recent PhD graduate expressed it:

> I always viewed a PhD as an apprenticeship, something that you had to serve. If you're very lucky you might enter the club and that's why I guess that total feeling of when I'd passed my orals of entering the club and of my hand being shaken. They said, 'Congratulations, Dr! You're one of only four or five in New Zealand in your area'. Anyway it was amazing.

The title 'Dr' wins admission to a select group. "To have a name", writes Judith Butler (1993, p. 72), "is to be positioned within the Symbolic, the idealized domain of kinship, a set of relationships structured through sanction". The name, she argues, "works as a politically invested and investing performative. To be named is thus to be inculcated into that law and to be formed bodily, in accordance with that law" (Butler, 1993, p. 72). Entering the long 'apprenticeship' or 'initiation' that is doctoral candidacy can be seen in this way - as an experience of 'recognition'; of recognising one's own reflection in the 'mirror' of others' proclamations that one is indeed 'doctoral material' and coming to describe oneself to oneself as such. How, then, did these New Zealand doctoral graduates come to so identify? By what processes did they come to see themselves as 'doctoral material?

For most, the process of coming to position themselves as 'doctoral material' was strongly influenced by how others addressed them, or 'spoke them into doctoral subject positions'. Elizabeth Ellsworth (1998, p.6) writes that "Mode of address ... is one of those intimate relations of social and cultural power that shapes and misshapes who teachers think students are, and who students come to think themselves to be." Only a few of those interviewed described proceeding from graduate to doctoral studies as almost 'automatic'. Simon was one who was mentored from an early stage of his degree course work:

> Sitting down and making a decision to do [a PhD] was as though I was socialised into doing it. And yes I think my supervisor had a major impact on that decision insofar as he'd just come back from doing his doctorate [overseas]. I was one of the first masters students that he supervised as a beginning lecturer and in that sense he functioned clearly as a mentor.

The most commonly-described experience of being 'hailed as doctoral material' was that of success at honours or masters level. For example, on completion of her bachelor's degree, Gina "got a letter from the Dean at the school of education after I graduated saying I hope you're considering post-graduate study. And that was my first consideration of it mind you." Similarly, Dulcie explained,

> It sounds incredibly passive and at the whims of others but personal encouragement had an awful lot to do with it, making you think even of the possibility of going on, that you had the potential to do something like a PhD. And again I got a postgraduate scholarship from the university, which took the issue of finances out of the equation. They paid my fees and also gave me living allowances and so it seemed like a good idea at the time.

Mentoring – coupled with financial support – was described as crucial by nearly all of my informants.

Like many others interviewed, Rachel's family and school background had not provided her with the cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1971) that made academic study feel 'natural' to her:

> Honestly, PhD! I didn't think of that at all even when I'd finished my Masters. Except that after I got the results one of lecturers said to me, "Did you can get a scholarship to do a PhD?" He said, "A scholarship for a PhD is $12000, not $5000 or $6000. I thought, "Shit!" Then he said, "It's not taxed!" I just thought, " WOW - that's fantastic!" To do what you wanted to do! I really liked it. But I don't think I ever really thought I'd finish a PhD 'cause I thought bright people did that.

For others, such friendly mentoring was less forthcoming. Fiona – also working-class – had experienced little encouragement to proceed from undergraduate work:

> Not one of those people ever - and this is my bitch about women in education - no, working class people in education that is what it is. It is not women its working class people although there was a gender thing there at that stage. Not one of those men that I was getting A++ in their classes ever said to me, "You must do a Masterate". Not one - ever. So I thought, "I'm not good enough," because no one ever talked to me about that ...

Similarly, at the end of her honours year: "I had gone through first class honours with those guys in that department and not one of them had ever said you should be applying for UGC Scholarships." Her application for a doctoral scholarship had come about as a result of a chance meeting with a junior lecturer, who had taught her previously in one course in another department:

> She said, " Come with me," and she took me - it's like depending on the kindness of strangers, it is incredible really. She took me to the registry and got the form that was an application for the scholarship - no one had ever said to me you should apply for a UGC. It is incredible. Myra - she was a junior lecturer ...

A chance meeting had also influenced Amy:

> It was actually a friend's husband who was a Professor in a different subject at that time. We were just walking through the streets of our suburb and he said, "You know, you're doing so well, your academic record is going really well, and what's your topic going to be for your PhD?" And did I know that I could do a doctorate and did I know that I could probably apply

> for a scholarship etc. etc? This was an absolute bolt out of the blue, I hadn't got it in my sight, my mind, at all.

For some, experiencing the heady pleasure of success was, in and of itself, the main spur to 'carry on' to do a doctorate. Lisa had entered university as a mature student:

> Well because they kept offering me, would you like a scholarship? ... I was really successful. I was enjoying success frankly. I hadn't had any really. Not that I'd been bad at what I'd done [before university] but no one had said to me, " Yeah you're great." At university they said, "You're wonderful", you know, and it felt really good, really affirming. So I suppose it gave me something that I hadn't had.

Similarly, Emma ranked success as a primary motivator for doing her doctorate. "I guess, " she said, "I did it because I found I could succeed. I had not believed that I could succeed. I'm a person who likes challenges and it was just amazing to find that I could pass. You pass once and you want to pass again - you want to just keep going for those goals and so I did."

Many of the doctoral graduates used the metaphor of a journey or a pathway. The following comment by Maurice exemplified this image: "it was a long rite de passage I guess for me. I saw it in those terms as a sort of journey, personal journey, that had two sides, the academic side and the biographical side." As Janet said, "You keep following on." Lionel explained: "I like to finish things and it wasn't finished till I had a doctorate." And, for Harold, "Having finished my Masters, I was driven to do this thing. It was there. A little bit like Ed Hillary - it was Everest and by gosh I was going to knock it off." Audrey had felt that " there was no strong other direction to take... A lot of it was just falling into - it wasn't a rut, but a pathway." And, for Andrea: "It just seemed the next thing to do, just like going from school to university, going from M.Phil. to a Ph.D. It's just the next thing to do."

Several had felt daunted by the length of time it would take to do a masters followed by a doctorate. For some, this pressure of time was exacerbated by the threat of financial indebtedness or by health or family concerns. Some had therefore bypassed the masters thesis and entered a doctorate straight from honours. Felicity had already developed a passion for research at honours level and upgraded her masters to a PhD thesis:

> It was just that I wanted to do research, that I wanted to fill it up with research you see. Now that's really important because I would never have seen myself as a person who would do a PhD. So the only way I could do a PhD would have been to be doing a masters that turned itself into a PhD

Similarly, Douglas's planned research was 'too big' to fit the confines of a masters:

> I didn't trust myself to just satisfy the requirements of a Masters thesis. I thought if I start writing a thesis I'll end up wanting to write the definitive work on it and I won't finish it in a

> year. I suppose I'd also been conscious and talked to people about the dangers of doing that and then ending up with a Masters degree for something that, with a bit more effort I could have got a Ph.D for. I wasn't daunted by the prospect of a big writing project. I felt like I was capable enough of getting my head around a big thing, big enough for a Ph.D.

While, for many – particularly the younger students – the decision to 'do research' or to 'do a PhD' had preceded full-time or tenurable academic employment, those who had done their doctorates in the period from the 1950s to the mid-1980s were often already holding university lectureships. In total, 21 of those interviewed (17 men and 4 women[10]) had done their doctorates while holding full-time university teaching and research positions. Another 12 (9 men and 3 women) had held various limited term appointments (junior lectureships, teaching assistantships etc) that were designed to offer doctoral candidates work experience, financial support, and (at least in theory), the time and space to complete their theses within the allocated time-frame. Ten of those interviewed (4 men and 6 women) had done their theses while employed full-time in teachers colleges or polytechnics; two of the candidates had held other full-time employment; and 11 (all women) had depended on scholarships and casual work to sustain them.

One of the earlier New Zealand PhD candidates explained the importance of family in his decision to do his doctorate locally in the post-war years:

> By the end of that year I had a wife and child. I got a postgraduate scholarship and normally the pattern in the past was people like me would have gone to Britain or somewhere, like the group before me, that was the traditional route. I'd been appointed as a junior lecturer. I wrote to the University of New Zealand and asked them in view of the fact that I had a wife and a baby and no money, could I defer it for a year or two and they said no. That's why I didn't take the usual route of going to London Institute of Education and doing Ph.D and had to rely on New Zealand. So when New Zealand brought in local Ph.Ds and allowing staff members to do it part-time, that was my saviour. I was able to do it in New Zealand. That's why I did it in New Zealand and not in the normal route.

Those who had won tenurable, or tenured positions during the years of rapid expansion in universities and in teacher education during the 1970s and early 1980s sometimes expressed a pragmatic approach to their doctoral studies. James decided to do his "when I was appointed to the lectureship. I decided that and it seemed pretty obvious that getting a doctorate was going to be important if I was going to have an academic career, so I saw that as something I needed to get onto as soon as possible." Similarly, another explained that for him:

---

[10] There were very few women teaching in university Education departments until the mid-1980s. For statistics, see Middleton, 1990.

> it was a sort of a - not exactly a meal ticket but it puts the seal on your qualifications as an academic I suppose. I was always fairly instrumental about it because a lot of the more interesting research that I wanted to get on with wouldn't have been very suitable for this Ph.D. topic anyway. And the next ten years after my Ph.D. were really getting my head around all of the more interesting stuff, the theory and things that I was really interested in.

Teachers College staff often found access to resources, encouragement, and information difficult to come by. Mark – a college lecturer with a passion for research – explained how, in his college in the 1970s, PhD study:

> was a darkness - we didn't know what it involved. I didn't know what a PhD involved. I knew it was a long slog that people went through. And I thought now what happens? Does someone give you an idea of, ' here is a project that we are working on in a team, come on board and do your PhD with it? Or was it just up to you to dream up a topic?

The change in government tertiary education policy in the 1990s meant that those colleges that began to offer their own degrees, and those that amalgamated with universities, needed more of their staff to hold higher degrees. As Harold explained, this meant that for at least some staff, the workplace climate became more encouraging:

> Once we became amalgamated I guess I had this idea in the back of my mind that to work in a tertiary institution you needed to be suitably qualified. And now that we were no longer a teachers college, but part of a university, it became more imperative that, as university staff, the former teachers college staff should be better qualified. I saw too that, certainly if I wanted any promotion or to move through the system, that the teachers college days were over and that we were in a new world which meant that you had to do research, you had to publish and you had to have better qualifications.

A similarly pragmatic, career-oriented, approach was adopted by some of the younger interviewees, who had embarked on doctorates in the 1990s and were dependent on scholarships and casualised academic work in a contracting academic labour market. Kate and Emma were both in their thirties when they graduated with PhDs. Both had determined, before they enrolled, that they wanted to become academics. Describing herself as 'ambitious', Kate – a former secondary school teacher with young children at the time - explained that she had decided on a doctorate:

> before I embarked on the Masters, because in fact what I was scheming was to see if I could get into a university position even with a good Masters degree. That was my first notion because I couldn't envisage the five or seven years. It was a seven-year process as it turned out for me for Masters and Ph.D, but I couldn't conceive of that. I think if I'd had to plan for that and have no income or no decent income for that length of time I probably wouldn't have embarked on it. But because it was considered incrementally, it became achievable. So even then I wanted to be a university teacher because I loved research, I loved teaching and that was the forum in which I could do both.

Similarly, Emma had set her sights on an academic career in her late twenties:

> I had laid my life out to do a PhD before I started the masters. I knew that there was no point in doing a masters if I wasn't going to do a PhD; that there would be no salary difference and career opportunities wouldn't be any different for me in teaching if I did a masters versus just a bachelors degree; that you only did a masters if you wanted to go on in those days. And so in doing a masters I knew then that I wanted to do, that I had to do a PhD. There was almost no turning back and I enjoyed research.

Her consuming desire to become an academic had meant resigning from a senior position in teaching to take up a scholarship and casual work:

> I wasn't sure then as to where it would head. I was just focussed on learning to become a scholar, someone who had a critical mind and could articulate issues. I actively at that time sought out information about what academic life was like to see if I could be an academic but again I didn't believe that I could be an academic ... In those days I thought that an academic was a scholar, someone who produced, someone who was focused on research and putting out brilliant ideas and also someone who provided a conscience for society, and who could almost safely speak up. I thought, " Hey that would be a neat role to do! We need more people in my area to do that!" I've since found it's not that easy, not as possible as the ideals that I held up. But in those days, I guess, I saw a very rosy side of being an academic.

Later papers will explore my interviewees' stories of their doctoral projects – their topics and methods, the conditions in which they worked, their work habits, organisation of time, space and domestic life, for "educating oneself and taking care of oneself are interconnected activities" (Foucault, 1986, p.51). The stories told in this first paper from my project have, I hope begun to chart a genealogy of some of the psychic, cultural, historical, intellectual, and institutional landscapes in which the 'will to scholarship' begins.

Beginnings

In a well-known admonition to Jana Sawicki, who was in the process of completing her doctoral thesis 'about' him, Foucault "suggested that I do not spend energy talking about him and, instead, do what he was doing, namely, write genealogies" (cited in Macey, 1995, p. 450). Foucault (1980b, p. 83) gave "the term *genealogy* to the union of erudite knowledge and local memories which allows us to establish a historical knowledge of struggles and to make use of this knowledge tactically today." We should, he said, "ask not the big theoretical questions of what is power? And Where does power come from?" Instead, he argued, we should focus on "the little question, What happens?" which, although 'Flat and empirical" allows us to scrutinise a much more "complex configuration of realities" (Foucault, 1982, p. 217). " It is", he argued, " not theory,

but life that matters, not knowledge but reality, not books but money etc" (Foucault, 1980b, p. 81). In my current project, as in previous work (Middleton, 1993, 1998), my 'uses of Foucault' are along these lines - I use what he described as his 'tool-kit' (Ibid, p. 143) to 'do genealogies.'

Like Foucault, and like my interviewees, "If I do the analyses I do, it's not because of some polemic I want to arbitrate but because I have been involved in certain conflicts ... " (Ibid, p. 65). The project that informs this paper emerges from twenty years of involvement with doctoral studies – as a student in the early 1980s; as a supervisor since the mid-1980s; as an assistant dean (graduate studies) in the 1990s; and, more recently, as a central university policy-maker and administrator. The pains and pleasures – agonies and ecstasies – described by the interviewees have stirred subterranean rumblings from my own doctoral experiences (Middleton, 1993; 1998). As Britzman argues (1998, p. 26), "Even though the manifest story of higher education is a story of reason and rationality, the latent content is more contentious: justified wills continue to clash as new editions of old learning conflicts are played out." For me, as well as for those whom I interviewed, the experience of doing a PhD can, in Foucauldian terms, be conceptualised as a tension between subjection to disciplinary norms and crafting the independent scholarly self.

Towards the end of his life, Foucault outlined his work as falling into three phases:

> A theoretical shift had seemed necessary in order to analyse what was often designated as the advancement of learning; it led me to examine the forms of discursive practices that articulated the human sciences. A theoretical shift had also been required in order to analyse what is often described as the manifestations of 'power;' it led me to examine, rather, the manifold relations, the open strategies, and the rational techniques that articulate the exercise of powers. It appeared that I now had to undertake a third shift, in order to analyse what is termed 'the subject'. It seemed appropriate to look for the forms and modalities of the relation to self by which the individual constitutes and recognises himself qua subject (Foucault, 1985, p. 6)

Foucault's early work on "the forms of discursive practices that articulated the human sciences" will help me explore the history of 'disciplining education' as an academic subject. His studies of 'the manifestations of power' (Foucault, 1977; 1980a) will assist my explorations of the panoptic surveillance of 'super-vision.' These two themes will be explored in later publications.[11] In this paper, and in its sequel this afternoon (Middleton, 2001), I have used the tools provided by Foucault's 'third shift' to help explore the biographical dimension of my interviews – the 'pre-histories' of their doctorates. In doing so, like Patricia Williams (1991, p. 93) I have conceptualised "the personal" as "not the same as the 'private'; the personal is often merely the highly particular".

---

[11] See note 1 above.

Or, conversely, as Lorrie Neilson puts it (1998, p. 7), "If we are socially constructed, our individual scholarly history must be, in its unique way, part of a history of the profession itself." I'm sure my interviewees – survivors all – will join me in echoing Foucault's words:

> As to those for whom to work hard, to begin and begin again, to attempt and be mistaken, to go back and rework everything from top to bottom, and still find reason to hesitate from one step to the next - as to those, in short, for whom to work in the midst of uncertainty and apprehension is tantamount to failure, all I can say is that clearly we are not from the same planet (Foucault, 1985, p. 7)

References

Althusser, I. (1971). Ideology & Ideological State Apparatusses'. In: L. Althusser (Ed.), *Lenin & philosophy* (pp. 127 186). London: Monthly Review Press.

Bateson, C. (1997). Foreword to A. Neumann & P. Peterson (Eds.), (1997). *Learning from our lives: Women, research & autobiography in education.* (pp. i – x) New York: Teachers College Press.

Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M.F.D. Young (Ed.), *Knowledge and control.* (pp. 47 – 69). London: Collier McMillan.

Bourdieu, P. (1971). Systems of education & systems of thought. In: M.F.D. Young (Ed). *Knowledge & control.* London: Croom Helm, pp. 189-207.

Britzman, D. (1998*). Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter.* Routledge: New York & London.

Casey, C. (1996). The new narrative research in education. In M. Apple (Ed.). *Review of research in education, 21.* Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Ellsworth, E. (1998). *Teaching positions.* New York: Teachers College Press

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline & punish.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980a). *A History of Sexuality, Volume 1.* New York: Vintage

Foucault, M. (1980b). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings 1972-1977.* (C. Gordon, Ed.) New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1982). Afterword: The subject and power. In H.L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism & hermeneutics.* Chicago: Harvester.

Foucault, M. (1985) *The Use of Pleasure. A History of Sexuality, Volume 11.* London: Penguin

Foucault, M. (1986) *The care of the self. A History of Sexuality, Volume 111.* London: Penguin

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hacking, I. (1991). How should we do the history of statistics? In: C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 181 – 123.

Haraway, D. (1997). *Modest_Witness@Second_Millenium.FemaleMan©_Meets_OncoMouse™* New York & London: Routledge

Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature & the geography of difference.* Cambridge Massachusetts and Oxford U.K.: Basil Blackwell.

Johannessen, I. (1998). Genealogy & progressive politics: Reflections on the notions of usefulness. In: T. Popkewitz & M. Brennan (Eds). (1998). *Foucault's Challenge: Discourse, knowledge & power in education.* New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia, pp 297 – 315.

Luke, T. (1997). Thinking about cultural politics in the university. In M. Peters (Ed). *Cultural politics in the university in Aotearoa/ New Zealand.* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Macey, D. (1995). *The lives of Michel Foucault.* New York: Vintage.

Mayo, C. (2000). The uses of Foucault. In *Educational theory.* 50 (1), pp. 103 – 116.

Middleton, S. (1990) American influences in the sociology of New Zealand education 1944-1988. In D. Philips; G. Lealand and G. McDonald (Eds.) *The impact of American ideas on New Zealand's educational policy, practice and thinking.* Wellington: N.Z.-U.S. Educational Foundation/N.Z. Council for Educational Research, pp.50-69.

Middleton, S (1993) *Educating Feminists - Life-histories and pedagogy* New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia.

Middleton, S. (1998). *Disciplining sexuality: Foucault, life-histories and education.* New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia

Middleton, S. (2001). *Making room: The placing of academic studies.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, April 10 – 14.

Middleton, S. and May, H. (1997). *Teachers talk teaching 1915 - 1995: Early childhood, schools, teachers' colleges.* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Mohanty, C. (1997). Preface: Dangerous territories, territorial power & education. In: L. Roman & L. Eyre. (Eds). (1997). *Dangerous territories: Struggles for difference & equality in education.* New York & London: Routledge, pp. ix– xvii.

Neilson, L. (1998). *Knowing her place: Research literacies & feminist occasions.* San Francisco: Caddo Gap Press.

Popkewitz, T. & Brennan, M. (1998). Restructuring of social & political theory in education: Foucault & the social epistemology of school practices. In: T. Popkewitz & M. Brennan (Eds). (1998). *Foucault's Challenge: Discourse, knowledge & power in education.* New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia, pp. 3-33.

Poster, M. (1995). *The second media age.* New York and Cambridge, England: Polity Press/ Blackwell.

Said, E. (1993). *Representations of the intellectual: The 1992 Reith lectures.* London: Vintage.

Smith, L. Tuhiwai. (1997) Decolonising intellectual identity: Maori, woman, academic. In M. Peters (Ed) *Cultural politics & the university in Aotearoa/ New Zealand.* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Weiler, K. & Middleton, S. (Eds). (1999) *Telling women's lives: Narrative inquiries in the history of women's education.* Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Williams, P. (1991). *The alchemy of race & rights.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.